

Re: can somebody verify this C program which calls dsaupd\_ ? (longish)

## Re: can somebody verify this C program which calls dsaupd\_ ? (longish)

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math.num-analysis/2005-04/msg00043.html>

---

- *From:* Madhusudan Singh <[spammers-go-here@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:spammers-go-here@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Sun, 03 Apr 2005 03:10:14 -0400
- 

H. S. wrote:

> Apparently, \_Madhusudan Singh\_, on 02/04/05 19:05, typed:  
>> H. S. wrote:  
>>  
>>  
>>>(terribly sorry for this long post which includes my two source files,  
>>>but I couldn't find out how put the files online using my Yahoo account)  
>>  
>>  
>> The problem is not with the length of your post but with the relevance to  
>> the newsgroup.  
>  
> Since I was requesting somebody who already has the FORTRAN libraries  
> installed and works with them to test if the program does call dsaupd\_  
> properly without getting info=-9999 as error, I do not see how the post  
> is NOT relevant to FORTRAN language newsgroup.

First, FORTRAN refers to the language upto and including f77. This newsgroup discusses all aspects of Fortran, including FORTRAN.

More importantly, if your libraries compiled correctly, they were fine. The problem would then lie in the C code. And that is not (please do not use caps - use \* \* instead to emphasize) relevant to a Fortran newsgroup.

ARPACK library comes with a very well documented Makefile, which has been tested by hundreds (if not thousands) of people (including myself). Its illogical to assume that a untested / not adequately tested C wrapper is ok, but the Makefiles are not.

It could be true, but it certainly would not be the first thing to suspect.

>  
>  
>> Please cross-post your question to comp.lang.c instead since your code is  
>> in C, not Fortran.  
>  
> But the code to be tested is the calling of FORTRAN libs and return of

Re: can somebody verify this C program which calls dsaupd\_ ? (longish)

Re: can somebody verify this C program which calls dsauPd\_ ? (longish)

- > those libs. As I already made quite clear, I just want to test the
- > FORTRAN part, not the C part. So if someone can run the C program

Read above.

- > against their ARPACK and BLAS libraries and can reply Yes or No to the
- > question whether they get expected values, the experiment is complete. C
- > does not come into play (except the compilation part). If the somebody
- > does get the expected results correctly, then I have a problem with my
- > FORTRAN libs. If not, then there probably is something wrong with the C
- > code. The latter is the next topic of discussion, not the current one.

If you used the Makefile included in the library (with the correct settings in ARmakes.inc – it would not even compile correctly if those settings were wrong), that is the wrong place to start looking for bugs.

Test what you wrote first (or whatever is the "weakest" in terms of testing). If that is sanity checked by some means, only then start casting the net wider. As a scientist, I am sure you can understand what logical elimination and sound experimental sequence means.

Further, as you partially realized when you made the post (assuming you tested your C code first), it would be better to first ask if someone was willing to test the code and only then send it to them off group. Posting a bunch of non-Fortran code and irritating people is not the most polite or even conducive way to get them to help you.

To better understand what I wrote, let me cast the choice in C :

If you were writing a piece of code using the GNU C library, and found unexpected behaviour, would you test your program first (and say consult someone on comp.lang.c) or start asking people if your glibc is compiled correctly ? The GNU C library is a widely used and extremely well-tested piece of code. Its the wrong thing to suspect first.

---

• **Follow-Ups:**

◆ **[Re: can somebody verify this C program which calls dsauPd\\_ ? \(longish\)](#)**

◇ From: H. S.

• Prev by Date: **[Re: can somebody verify this C program which calls dsauPd\\_ ? \(longish\)](#)**

• Next by Date: **[Re: A question on Newton's Method](#)**

• Previous by thread: **[Re: can somebody verify this C program which calls dsauPd\\_ ? \(longish\)](#)**

• Next by thread: **[Re: can somebody verify this C program which calls dsauPd\\_ ? \(longish\)](#)**

• Index(es):

◆ **[Date](#)**

◆ **[Thread](#)**